

VZCZCXYZ0017
RR RUEHWEB

DE RUEHNO #0392/01 1781516
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
R 271516Z JUN 07
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 1000
INFO RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC
RHMFISS/CDRUSAREUR HEIDELBERG GE
RHMFISS/CDR USJFCOM NORFOLK VA
RHMFISS/CDR USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE
RHMFISS/USNMR SHAPE BE
ZEN/USDELMC BRUSSELS BE

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 000392

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

STATE FOR T, EUR/PRA, EUR/RPM, AND AC/SEA
DEFENSE FOR GSA (BENKERT, GROSS)

E.O. 12958: DECL: 06/27/2017

TAGS: [MARR](#) [MCAP](#) [MNUC](#) [NATO](#) [PREL](#) [PARM](#)

SUBJECT: NATO SENIOR DEFENSE GROUP ON PROLIFERATION (DGP)
PLENARY MEETING, MAY 24 2007

Classified By: ACTING DEFAD RANDY HOAG FOR REASONS 1.4 (B&D)

11. (C) SUMMARY. On May 24 2007, Mr. Joseph Benkert, OSD PDASD for Global Security Affairs, and Mr. Ivan Dvorak, Chief of Defense Policy and Strategy Division, Czech Republic, co-chaired the NATO Senior Defense Group on Proliferation (DGP) Plenary session. The DGP discussed two Food-For-Thought papers on Strengthening Host Nation CBRN Defense Capabilities and Maritime Interdiction Operation. The DGP also considered the upcoming Progress Report to the Joint Committee on Proliferation (JCP), the 2007-08 DGP Work Programme, the 2007 North Atlantic Council (NAC) Seminar on Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), the next step in NATO's consultations with Ukraine on CBRN defense, and updates on the Render Safe, CBRN Improvised Explosive Devices, and Disease Surveillance System initiatives. During Any Other Business (AOB), the Romanian delegation announced that they will co-chair the DGP in 2009-10. End Summary.

DGP POLICY GUIDANCE

12. (C) Under the Policy Guidance agenda topic the Group considered first the May 4th revision of the paper on Building Host-nation and Partner,s CBRN Defense Capabilities. During the discussion of the updated paper, the French delegate stated that support should be provided on an ad hoc basis, as assets were scarce, and even then only on the basis of a formal request by the host nation due to sovereignty issues. In addition the delegate requested that the paper be amended to show that the framework concept had only been approved by the Military Committee (MC), not at the NAC. The Turkish representative agreed with the French in stating that limited support should be provided only on a case-by-case basis with due consideration given to the threat assessment. He felt that the paper was not quite ready to be finalized and indicated a concern regarding overlap of activity involving partner support in other fora that would need to be de-conflicted. Consideration for how NATO interacts with partners in the area of CBRN defense should also be explored by the NATO Military Authorities through the Defense Requirements Review process, reflecting the needs of the Allies. Canada offered its general support and requested a definition of "host-nation." Italy also wanted that

definition and commented that the paper still needs more work. Italy suggested that the title might more properly use the verb "fostering" rather than building. The Co-Chair thanked the participants for their comments and promised another draft of the paper.

¶3. (C) Revision one of the paper on Maritime Interdiction Aimed at the Prevention of Trafficking by Sea of WMD was issued on May 4 and was reviewed by the DGP. The French representative began the discussion by indicating that France is interested and generally supportive of the Paper. However, France noted that there are concerns with the legal basis for NATO-led interdictions relative to the sovereignty of nations, which must be clarified in the Paper. The representative suggested giving the mandate to the military authorities to study these legal questions. Following the DGP Plenary meeting, the Co-Chairs met with the French delegation to find common ground on this and other issues. The resulting compromises will be incorporated into the next draft of the Paper. In the view of the Canadian representative, the paper must have a sound legal review with input from the nations. In addition, the representative requested that the NMAs provide a briefing on the status of stand-off detection capability for chemical and biological weapons. Both the United Kingdom and Italian representatives voiced support for the paper, with the Italians noting that the current text does allow for consideration of many issues brought to fore, urging action instead of talk to move the process forward. The Co-Chair requested nations to provide written inputs in one week and reminded the committee that they must focus on those things that NATO could do.

DGP AND NATO ACTIVITIES

¶4. (C) The DGP prepared a draft Progress Report of the JCP which will be submitted through the NAC in permanent session for notation by the Defense Ministers during their meeting in mid-June. The first revision of this report was discussed. The French delegate approved of the idea of the report but proposed that the paragraph regarding the Virtual Stockpile be amended to reflect the need to assess its utility and national interest. The German delegate commented that the work on the Virtual Stockpile should be held in abeyance until consensus could be reached on the usefulness of this tool. The Canadian delegate cautioned that we should not pre-judge the outcome of the project. The Co-Chair offered to find new wording to describe the way forward on the Virtual Stockpile and to re-issue the paper under silence. This paper passed silence on June 8th and was submitted to Ministers for notation on June 14th.

¶5. (C) The DGP considered a revised draft of its Work Programme for 2007-2008. The United Kingdom representative volunteered to be the lead nation for the project on repatriation of contaminated human remains. The Canadian, Norwegian, Italian, and Turkish representatives suggested that the DGP needed to further assess the utility of the Virtual Stockpile. Concerning the section in the Work Programme on capabilities, the Co-Chair stated that the CBRN Center of Excellence (CoE) would continue to be of interest and that he expected that the DGP would monitor and support its progress. He went on to raise the issue of "deliverables" for the 2008 summit in Bucharest. Norway suggested potential deliverables as: an end-state report for the Prague Capabilities Initiative; that the DGP investigate new initiatives; and that the Steering Committee should consider areas for further guidance. The Co-Chairs concluded that the program of work should be timed such that the DGP could report meaningful progress to the 2008 summit and invited comments on this idea within one month.

TRAINING, EXERCISES AND SEMINARS

16. (U) The WMD-C hosted a Tiger Team for the 2007 NAC WMD seminar and WgCdr Andy Proudlove, Royal Air Force, reported their results to the plenary. A seminar objective was agreed by the team and proposals for three different themes were provided. The Co-Chair stated the seminar theme would feature deployed forces in out-of-area operations and modeling and simulation would be used to look at current and enhanced capabilities in order to identify what yet needs to be done. The Co-Chair suggested that the team should look in more detail at a bio-event and added that experts would be available during the seminar as they have been in the past. Norway observed that the challenge was to operationalize the theme and to avoid DGP agenda details. The German representative wished to see an introduction to the changes in the CBRN threat picture incorporated, as well as a discussion on how NATO should transform its capabilities to address new threats. The Italian delegate reminded the Group that there must be an exchange of political views. The Canadian representative wished to see toxic industrial chemicals added to the seminar contents. The Co-Chair saw a consensus within the national comments and tasked the WMDC to produce a follow-on paper to carry work forward, noting that planning is now late in the process.

CAPABILITIES

17. (U) The Group received an informational briefing from Allied Command Transformation (ACT) on the follow-on work to MC511. ACT provided the background and chronology of its development and reported that the fourth draft has been sent to nations for notation. An explanation was given of the assumptions, general considerations (including sound legal basis), and the courses of action available with the emphasis on enhanced intelligence sharing. The action plan for the

follow-on work on MC511 has now been decoupled from the conceptual document and will be incorporated into the Defense Requirements Review (DRR) process for implementation.

18. (C) The International Military Staff (IMS) provided an update on two CBRN related capabilities, those of Render Safe and CBRN Improvised Explosive Devices. The briefer pointed out that the reach-back capability would be needed to do Render-Safe operations and that this could be accomplished via the NATO Intelligence Fusion Center (IFC). The Bi-SC concept on Reach-back was being developed now and involved numerous bodies such as the Joint Capabilities Group, the NATO Standardization Agency and the NATO Training Group. The IMS then addressed the asymmetric threat posed by Improvised Explosive Devices (IED) and the need to counter them. A Request For Information (RFI) has been sent to the IFC for support in this effort. The goal is for the commander to be able to defeat the threat in total, not simply detect IEDs. Work on the tactical implementation documents is underway and the benefits of training in ISAF have already been demonstrated.

19. (C) An update report on the Disease Surveillance System (DSS) was provided by the Committee of the Chiefs of Military Medical Services (COMEDS). The goal of the DSS is to gain time in the evolution of an out break so that treatment can start early. The DSS is a component of the larger health care system. The goal is to have a NATO capability by 2010 and this depends on the progress of the logistic functional services package in which it is embedded. Recent DSS activity includes the ACT experiments, work underway on AMEP-21 and the tasking to the June COMEDS conference in Halifax. National systems are in place now and comprise an interim DSS capability. The next step is to link these national systems and to support national endorsement of the logistic functional services package. The French delegate cautioned about the setting up of any DSS center for data collection and COMEDS responded that such a system might well be virtual and, in any case, interim in duration. Following

the COMEDS briefing the Co-Chair introduced a paper on expediting implementation of the DSS initiative. The purpose of the paper is to bring to the attention of Defense Ministers certain interim capabilities and to task further work on final or advanced capabilities. France raised concerns about the term Medical Analysis Center and preferred to refer to the notion using the more generic term of "process." Germany pointed out that there is a need to distinguish between natural outbreaks and a deliberate attack and wanted to see a near real-time data processing capability. Several nations asked to delete the recommendation proposing recognition at the June 2007 ministerials and the 2008 Summit. The Co-Chair asked for written comments within one week.

INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH

¶10. (U) The DGP received a report from the WMD Center on the status of joint meetings with Ukraine. The genesis of the engagement was a written request from the Head of the Ukrainian Mission at NATO and the established NATO-Ukraine Partnership Goals. Three areas were identified for discussions: the exchange of CBRN information; CBRN protection of deployed forces; and training. At a recent joint meeting it was decided that a brochure of Ukrainian national defense capabilities could be produced which would promote a better understanding of her requirements and that the Ukraine could take more active participation in appropriate NATO activities and working groups. Furthermore, the DGP decided that it could release documents from its annual seminar in Prague to Ukraine. The Canadian delegate announced that it was already providing language training to Ukraine, an important factor in promoting their engagement with NATO. The Czech Republic suggested a policy guidance workshop at which an inventory of national bi-lateral activities could be compiled in an effort to avoid the duplication of support activities for Ukraine. Poland informed the DGP that Ukrainian officers were enrolled in their training academy and that they had seventy bi-lateral

projects underway at the moment. The Co-Chair concluded that CBRN support to Ukraine should remain on the DGP agenda and tasked the WMD Center to make plans for a second joint meeting to take place.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

¶11. (U) During Any Other Business (AOB), the Romanian delegate announced that Romania will be a DGP co-chair in 2009-10; the Bulgarian representative announced that Bulgaria will host a DGP "Away Day" in 2009; and the Co-Chairs announced that they have tasked the WMD-C to host an informal meeting of all the NATO bodies dealing with CBRN defense in the autumn to winter 2007 timeframe.

NULAND